

UNITED NATIONS



SECURITY COUNCIL OFFICIAL RECORDS

FORTIETH YEAR

2594th

MEETING: 17 JUNE 1985

NEW YORK

CONTENTS

	<i>Page</i>
Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2594)	1
Adoption of the agenda	1
The situation in Namibia:	
(a) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17213);	
(b) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Mozambique to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17222);	
(c) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/17242)	1

NOTE

Symbols of United Nations documents are composed of capital letters combined with figures. Mention of such a symbol indicates a reference to a United Nations document.

Documents of the Security Council (symbol S/ . . .) are normally published in quarterly *Supplements* of the *Official Records of the Security Council*. The date of the document indicates the supplement in which it appears or in which information about it is given.

The resolutions of the Security Council, numbered in accordance with a system adopted in 1964, are published in yearly volumes of *Resolutions and Decisions of the Security Council*. The new system, which has been applied retroactively to resolutions adopted before 1 January 1965, became fully operative on that date.

2594th MEETING

Held in New York on Monday, 17 June 1985, at 3.30 p.m.

President: Mr. Errol MAHABIR (Trinidad and Tobago).

Present: The representatives of the following States: Australia, Burkina Faso, China, Denmark, Egypt, France, India, Madagascar, Peru, Thailand, Trinidad and Tobago, Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, Union of Soviet Socialist Republics, United Kingdom of Great Britain and Northern Ireland, United States of America.

Provisional agenda (S/Agenda/2594)

1. Adoption of the agenda
2. The situation in Namibia:
 - (a) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17213);
 - (b) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Mozambique to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17222);
 - (c) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/17242)

The meeting was called to order at 4.10 p.m.

Adoption of the agenda

The agenda was adopted.

The situation in Namibia:

- (a) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of India to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17213);
- (b) Letter dated 23 May 1985 from the Permanent Representative of Mozambique to the United Nations addressed to the President of the Security Council (S/17222);
- (c) Further report of the Secretary-General concerning the implementation of Security Council resolutions 435 (1978) and 439 (1978) concerning the question of Namibia (S/17242)

1. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decisions taken at the 2583rd meeting, I invite the representative of Liberia to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Kofa (Liberia) took a place at the Council table.

2. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at the 2583rd meeting, I invite the Acting President of the United Nations Council for Namibia and the other members of the delegation to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Ouyahia, Acting President, and the other members of the delegation of the United Nations Council for Namibia took a place at the Council table.

3. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with the decision taken at the 2583rd meeting, I invite Mr. Nujoma to take a place at the Council table.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Nujoma took a place at the Council table.

4. The PRESIDENT: In accordance with decisions taken at previous meetings on this item [2583rd to 2587th, 2589th, 2590th and 2592nd meetings], I invite the representatives of Afghanistan, Algeria, Angola, Argentina, Bangladesh, Barbados, Bhutan, Bolivia, Botswana, Brazil, Bulgaria, Cameroon, Canada, the Congo, Cuba, Cyprus, Czechoslovakia, Democratic Yemen, Ethiopia, the German Democratic Republic, the Federal Republic of Germany, Ghana, Guyana, Haiti, Hungary, Indonesia, Jamaica, Japan, Kenya, Kuwait, the Lao People's Democratic Republic, Lesotho, the Libyan Arab Jamahiriya, Malaysia, Malta, Mexico, Mongolia, Morocco, Mozambique, Nicaragua, Nigeria, Pakistan, Panama, Poland, Seychelles, South Africa, Sri Lanka, the Sudan, the Syrian Arab Republic, Turkey, Uganda, the United Arab Emirates, the United Republic of Tanzania, Viet Nam, Yugoslavia, Zambia and Zimbabwe to take the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Zarif (Afghanistan), Mr. Bessaïeh (Algeria), Mr. Van-Dunem (Angola), Mr. Muñiz (Argentina), Mr. Choudhury (Bangladesh), Mr. Moseley (Barbados), Mr. Tshering (Bhutan), Mrs. Carrasco (Bolivia), Mr. Legwaila (Botswana), Mr. Maciel (Brazil), Mr. Tsvetkov (Bulgaria), Mr. Engo (Cameroon), Mr. Lewis (Canada), Mr. Gayama (Congo), Mr. Malmierca (Cuba), Mr. Moushoutas (Cyprus), Mr. César (Czechoslovakia), Mr. Al-Ashtal (Democratic Yemen), Mr. Dinka (Ethiopia), Mr. Ott (German Democratic Republic), Mr. Lautenschlager (Federal Republic of Germany), Mr. Asamoah (Ghana), Mr. Sinclair (Guyana), Mr. Charles (Haiti), Mr. Foldeak (Hungary), Mr. Kusumaatmadja (Indonesia), Mr. Shearer (Jamaica), Mr. Kuroda (Japan), Mr. Kiilu (Kenya), Mr. Abulhassan

(Kuwait), Mr. Vongsay (Lao People's Democratic Republic), Mr. Makeka (Lesotho), Mr. Azzarouk (Libyan Arab Jamahiriya), Mr. Zain (Malaysia), Mr. Gauci (Malta), Mr. Muñoz Ledo (Mexico), Mr. Nyamdoo (Mongolia), Mr. Alaoui (Morocco), Mr. Murargy (Mozambique), Mr. D'Escoto Brockmann (Nicaragua), Mr. Gambari (Nigeria), Mr. Shah Nawaz (Pakistan), Mr. Cabrera Jovane (Panama), Mr. Nowak (Poland), Ms. Gonthier (Seychelles), Mr. von Schirnding (South Africa), Mr. Wijewardane (Sri Lanka), Mr. Birido (Sudan), Mr. Al-Atassi (Syrian Arab Republic), Mr. Türkmen (Turkey), Mr. Odaka (Uganda), Mr. Al-Mosfir, (United Arab Emirates), Mr. Mkapa (United Republic of Tanzania), Mr. Le Kim Chung (Viet Nam), Mr. Golob (Yugoslavia), Mr. Goma (Zambia) and Mr. Mudenge (Zimbabwe) took the places reserved for them at the side of the Council chamber.

5. The PRESIDENT: I should like to inform the Council that I have received a letter from the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran in which he requests to be invited to participate in the discussion of the item on the agenda. In accordance with the usual practice, I propose, with the consent of the Council, to invite that representative to participate in the discussion, without the right to vote, in accordance with the relevant provisions of the Charter and rule 37 of the Council's provisional rules of procedure.

At the invitation of the President, Mr. Rajaie-Khorassani (Islamic Republic of Iran) took the place reserved for him at the side of the Council chamber.

6. The PRESIDENT: The first speaker is the representative of Barbados. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

7. Mr. MOSELEY (Barbados): My delegation is very grateful for the privilege accorded it of being allowed to speak on this important occasion when the question of Namibia is being debated once again.

8. I call this occasion important for at least two reasons. First, in a general sense, it is important since every time the question of Namibia comes before this Council it involves a picking up of the gauntlet of defiance flung in the face of the whole of the United Nations by an arrogant Pretoria—that Government which is so confident of its support in the corridors of international power that it boasts that no power on earth will make it deviate from the policy of *apartheid* and the perpetual domination of the majority in southern Africa by the minority. Secondly, Mr. President, and for a happier and more private reason, this occasion is important because, for the first time, my delegation sees the Council presided over by the representative of Trinidad and Tobago. I am confident that you will agree that, until some device is invented to lift one or other of our countries and transport it physically to some region outside the Caribbean, our destinies, like our pasts, will remain economically, sociologically and emotionally inextricably bound up. My delegation has every confidence that your ability, your integrity and your experience will provide outstanding guidance to the Council for the conduct of its affairs during the month of June.

9. I must also claim the privilege of congratulating your predecessors, the representatives of Thailand, for the excellent manner in which they guided the work of the Council during the month of May.

10. The question of Namibia has been aired and debated so thoroughly and so often that it seems difficult to conceive why it should still be necessary for so many representatives to say so much on the matter. It seems difficult, too, to believe that so much should have been said for so long with such little result. It is now nearly 19 years since the General Assembly by its resolution 2145 (XXI) of 27 October 1966 terminated South Africa's Mandate over Namibia. In 1978 this Council adopted resolution 435 (1978), which approves a negotiated and agreed plan for the independence of Namibia. And yet, in spite of the numerous strong resolutions that have been adopted both in the Council and in the General Assembly, the people of Namibia are no nearer to independence than they were in 1966. In fact, if the plans of the Pretoria Government are successful, on this very day the people of Namibia may well have moved further from true independence than they were in 1966. That, in brief, is the amazing record of Pretoria's success so far in frustrating the will of the whole international community.

11. I am sure that there are very many delegations which, like mine, believe that what is at stake as we consider the question of Namibia once again is not only independence for the Namibian people but also the very authority of the Council. This, I believe, is one reason why so many Ministers for Foreign Affairs and so many delegations have elected to join their voices in public affirmation of support for the Council, in solidarity with the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and in evidence of a determination that Namibia shall be independent.

12. From all that has been said in the course of this debate there can be no doubt that at the root of the failure of all efforts to achieve the goal of independence for Namibia lie at least two factors: first, there is the determination repeatedly stated by Pretoria that no power on earth can make that Government alter its policy of *apartheid*; and, secondly, there are the natural resources of Namibia, the greed for which compels so many fair-speaking countries to betray their inner conviction that the "grab for Africa", so brazenly practised in the nineteenth century, should now be discontinued—even at the end of the twentieth.

13. Earlier in the course of this debate, those present in the Council chamber were treated to what may best be described as a test of their gullibility when the representative of the Pretoria régime was permitted to speak in the Council. Without daring to mention even once the word *apartheid*, he delivered a statement which must surely rank among the most cynical and specious ever heard in this chamber. Let me illustrate a few examples. In almost his first sentence, he said: "Furthermore, South Africa is an integral part of the southern African region. Whether one likes it or not, this is a fact" [2583rd meeting, para. 200]. That out of the mouth of the representative of a Govern-

ment whose creed is *apartheid*. The brazenness of this cynicism fills the mind with a sense of horror. If there was a divine right given to the Afrikaaner to leave his home, travel thousands of miles and take by force, or even otherwise, the lands of other people, surely that right could only have been given upon condition that there should be a fair sharing of and a partnership in the lands usurped. A fair sharing and integration such as would justify the use of the term "integral part" is the very opposite of the abomination that is *apartheid*. By no stretch of the imagination can practitioners and disciples of *apartheid* be considered an integral part of those who are truly African.

14. This Council was told by the representative of Pretoria that countries in the region should abide by certain ground rules. He said:

"First, no State should make its territory available to individuals or organizations that wish to promote or prepare for violence against other States in the region. The fact is that all the countries of southern Africa have disaffected groups and dissident movements." [*Ibid.*, para. 201.]

Apart from the patent absurdity of the implication that there is a single country in the whole world in which there are no disaffected groups or dissident movements, there is the absolutely incredible invitation to regard 20 million black Africans fighting for the most basic of human rights in their own land as a disaffected group or a dissident movement. In the eyes of Pretoria, it is monstrous and unthinkable that those whom they disparagingly refer to as Kaffirs should not sit still and accept genocide as their just fate.

15. The following is another so-called ground rule: "no foreign forces should be permitted to intervene in the region" [*ibid.*, para. 202]. No comment is needed here but to say that that is a plain demand that Pretoria should be allowed free rein to stamp Angola and Botswana, Namibia and the rest with the evil hoofmarks of *apartheid* while the world looks on and applauds.

16. The third "ground rule" states: "South Africa believes that the problems of conflict in our region should be solved by peaceful means" [*ibid.*, para. 203]. How a problem of conflict can be solved by peaceful means we are not told; but at least the representative of Pretoria recognized that, for millions of black Africans, the problem of *apartheid* on their native soil is a problem of conflict, not just a mere problem. For, contrary to the fraud which the apologists for the system perpetrate upon the naïve and simplistic, *apartheid* is not merely colour prejudice to be solved by simple and peripheral civil rights legislation. It is far more sinister than that—it is a doctrine of perpetual domination, dispossession and degradation.

17. It is not necessary for me to say much more. I would only add for the record that Barbados stands firmly behind the demand that Council resolution 435 (1978) be fully implemented; is unshaken in its support of the South West Africa People's Organization (SWAPO), the authentic rep-

resentative of the Namibian people; and is most earnest in its appeal to the contact group to recognize the basic insincerity of the Pretoria régime, which will clearly use every excuse, however fraudulent, to maintain its illegal hold on Namibia.

18. The Council must not impotently surrender to the deceit and arrogance of Pretoria. It must act in the firm belief that the majority of Africans will never accept the application of *apartheid* in their land. The Council must act with the solemn determination that, in spite of the obstacles imposed by greed, Namibia must gain independence if the Council itself is not to be for ever humiliated and rendered altogether impotent.

19. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Lesotho. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

20. Mr. MAKEKA (Lesotho): We wish to express our profound gratitude, through you, Mr. President, to the Council for granting us the opportunity to participate in these very important deliberations on Namibia's future. We are more than delighted to see you presiding over these deliberations and are confident that, under your very able guidance, the Council will live up to its responsibility and adopt a decision that will lead to the implementation of its resolution 435 (1978) and eventual freedom and independence for the Namibian people.

21. Permit me also to pay tribute to the Minister for Foreign Affairs and the representative of Thailand for guiding the Council's work during the month of May.

22. The United Nations as a whole, and its General Assembly and the Security Council in particular, have been seized of the vexing problem of the illegal occupation of Namibia by South Africa since the inception of the Organization. During all these years the international community, through numerous Assembly and Council resolutions, and, indeed, through decisions and opinions of the International Court of Justice, has tried in vain to get South Africa out of Namibia. Council resolution 435 (1978) represented a leap forward in this endeavour, because not only was it fully backed by the Western countries, but it was acceptable to South Africa, at least on paper. It is clear, therefore, that resolution 435 (1978) represents the only acceptable basis for a solution to the problem. Like previous speakers, we would like to add our voice in calling for a speedy implementation of the resolution. The report of the Secretary-General reveals that virtually all outstanding issues have been resolved, except that South Africa still maintains that the withdrawal of Cuban troops from Angola is a precondition for the implementation of the resolution [*S/17242*, para. 45].

23. From the very first day that the international community called upon South Africa to leave Namibia, South Africa has come up with one excuse after another, designed to frustrate that will and perpetuate its presence there, which has brought untold suffering to the Namibians, whose welfare and freedom are pivotal in this exercise. Not

only is *apartheid* and racial discrimination against the majority of people, who are of non-European origin, being extended from South Africa to Namibia, not only are the immense natural resources of Namibia being depleted by foreign and South African companies, but thousands of Namibians are being killed, imprisoned and forced to flee their country, and more recently they are being forced to join the forces of oppression and occupation. As if this were not enough, South Africa has used and continues to use the territory of Namibia as a base for attacks and acts of aggression against neighbouring countries. The recent events in Cabinda, where South African soldiers en route to commit acts of sabotage were killed, after South Africa had made a fanfare of the withdrawal of its forces from Angola, must convince even non-believers that South Africa is more than ever determined to stay in Namibia.

24. South Africa used all forms of delaying tactics while in fact it was consolidating its position in Namibia. We have seen the Turnhalle agreements, we have heard, and still hear, about the linkage issue of the withdrawal of Cuban forces in Angola, and we now hear about the setting up of a transitional government in Namibia. Where will this lead to? When will South Africa learn that nothing short of resolution 435 (1978) and full sovereign independence for Namibia will be acceptable to the Namibians and to the international community? It should not surprise anybody that the people of Namibia, under the sole, authentic leadership of SWAPO, whose very able President, Mr. Sam Nujoma, is here with us, will continue their armed struggle until victory is achieved. South Africa and those who pat it on the back must know that SWAPO and the people of Namibia will ultimately win, because time is on their side, and their struggle is historic and noble. It follows, therefore, that the so-called transitional government is nothing but a sham, and must be declared null and void by the Council.

25. Those developments are of serious concern not only to my country, which is a neighbour of both South Africa and Namibia, but to the whole world community. The existence of *apartheid* and racial discrimination in South Africa has brought untold difficulties, problems and misery not only for South Africans, but for my country and other neighbouring countries. The recent events, which resulted in massacres of unarmed South Africans who have skin of a different colour from that of their masters, show that the South African Government is far from abandoning *apartheid* in the interest of peace in our region. The callous brutality of *apartheid* in South Africa and in Namibia breeds refugees who flee in huge numbers into my country and other neighbouring countries. In our giving asylum and haven to these refugees, most of whom are school-going children, we bring upon ourselves the wrath of Pretoria. It is sad that South Africa has accorded to itself police powers in the region, hitting left and right in a fury blinded by *apartheid*. In its determination to protect and preserve *apartheid* in South Africa and Namibia, South Africa has become a bully, engaging in terrible acts of aggression against its powerless and poor neighbours. The Council may recall that in 1982 we were forced to appear before it following an attack on our capital city, Maseru, by South Africa, in which 42 innocent refugees and citizens of Lesotho were killed in cold blood.

26. Never before has South Africa defied the Council as it did early in the morning of Friday, 14 June, when South African troops, with impunity and in South Africa's usual high-handed manner, committed yet another act of wanton aggression, this time against Botswana. What is ironic is that the barbarous attack on the capital city of Botswana takes place at a time when the Council is seized of yet other acts of aggression just across the border of Botswana—in Namibia. Indeed, the South African presence in Namibia cannot be described as anything but an act of aggression against the Territory and people of Namibia. That gross violation of sovereignty and territorial integrity of the peace-loving people of Botswana proves beyond reasonable doubt that South Africa cannot be referred to as a force of peace in our region. Not one country has ever attacked South Africa, but South Africa has been the aggressor and a source of insecurity for all of us, and as such it is more than a serious threat to international peace and security.

27. As the Prime Minister of my country stated in his message of support, sympathy and condolences to the Government and people of Botswana,

"We can understand the indignation of the people of Botswana over this wanton attack, which is all the more objectionable because your Government has consistently advocated peaceful resolution of problems of southern Africa whilst drawing attention to the danger posed to the entire region by the cynical and immoral policy of *apartheid*. We are aware that the allegation that there were ANC [African National Congress of South Africa] bases in Gaborone is an empty pretext for the flexing of muscles at the expense of defenceless people by a country which sees itself as a regional super-Power. We reiterate that problems of South Africa are internal, and no venting of emotions by the *apartheid* régime—through attacks on neighbours—shall disguise this truth to the friends of South Africa nor to the world.

"The attack on Botswana is reminiscent of the December 1982 attack on Lesotho and should demonstrate conclusively to the international community that there can be no lasting peace in the southern African region unless the edifice of *apartheid* is destroyed. We are confident that all peace-loving peoples will stand with the people of Botswana and we should like to assure you of our moral support now and in the future until we can live in peace free from the scourge of racism and *apartheid*."

28. The challenge before the Council is immense. The time has come to bring an end to *apartheid*. The Council owes it to humanity to take the necessary steps now to ensure that South Africa gets out of Namibia, because that is the first and vital step towards the freedom of all the people of South Africa and the elimination of *apartheid*. The Charter of the United Nations accords the Council full powers to deal with situations that are a threat to international peace and security. South Africa has proved that it is not only the aggressor in our region, but a destabilizing

force. The questions we pose to the Council are: for how long will South Africa be allowed to defy the Council and the world community regarding this question of Namibia and how many people should South Africa kill, both in South Africa and in the neighbouring countries, before the Council acts?

29. We in southern Africa live in fear and terror and we are worried that the chances of a peaceful solution to the core of the problem are being missed.

30. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Malta. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

31. Mr. GAUCI (Malta): Mr. President, from the islands of Malta and Gozo to the islands of Trinidad and Tobago, I bring you warm and friendly Commonwealth greetings. We are honoured by your distinguished presence here. I personally am encouraged for many reasons, one of them symbolic. I am reminded of one evening at your Mission during my earliest years at the United Nations, way back in 1967. From an intensive conversation in your Ambassador's office, we obtained your country's co-operation and were thereby encouraged to launch the initiative of the then so-called sea-bed item, 18 years ago. I have no doubt that you share my regret that the resultant United Nations Convention on the Law of the Sea is not yet fully universal, and that its final shape was not exactly what we had both originally advocated. But by all accounts it is still a monumental achievement. From a hesitant start, then, our two countries were the very first pioneer investors of thought, time and effort in that subsequent gigantic exercise. The 1967 vision of the common heritage of mankind became a reality in 1984. I trust that, similarly, under your guidance this month we shall be equally successful with Namibia and that success will soon be achieved, because much effort has already been expended and the goal is not beyond reach.

32. I have already had the pleasure of complimenting the Minister for Foreign Affairs and the representative of Thailand on the sterling service they rendered the Council in the exercise of the presidency last month. I have pleasure in repeating those compliments today.

33. In his reports, the Secretary-General catalogues the main events of the past seven years. We commend him for his latest objective report [S/17242], and even more for his indefatigable efforts to promote progress. His report provides the necessary focus for our attention, and in its concluding paragraph we have the nub of our present predicament.

34. On going through our own records I find that, as a member of the Council, I stated Malta's view on this particular item twice in 1983—on 31 May and 27 October [2449th and 2480th meetings]. I do not wish to repeat myself today.

35. Instead I have listened with deep sympathy to the interventions of others, made at such a high level, and I

find in those statements an unmistakable expression of depth of feeling and conviction that no further obstacle should stand in the way of early independence for Namibia.

36. With the exception of one single dissonant voice, from the four quarters of the globe—with facts, eloquence and conviction—the clarion call for progress in the unqualified terms of resolution 435 (1978) has been reaffirmed.

37. It is therefore sufficient for me to repeat that we share those convictions and to regret that independence is not yet at hand. It is also clear where the difficulties lie and that only one obstacle stands squarely in the way.

38. I am being deliberately restrained in my language. This is not because I am not passionately for immediate independence for Namibia, not because I do not abhor *apartheid*, not because I do not share the feelings of outrage at the violence in southern Africa, at the repressive practices of the South African authorities, at the delaying tactics persistently being introduced in the delicate negotiating process. I do so for other reasons. I do not wish to add fuel to the fire, nor do I wish to give South Africa any pretext conveniently to pretend that the Security Council is on one of its periodic public exercises of pillorying South Africa's policies—a self-serving shield behind which, abetted by some barons of the press, South Africa tries to seek shelter. If the whole world is expressing dissatisfaction, then South Africa should examine its own conscience and listen to its eternal whisperings.

39. The South African authorities would in fact only be deluding themselves and their people if they failed to heed the widespread determination of countries to promote a peaceful settlement of the Namibian issue and to bring about racial equality and harmony inside South Africa itself. This message is constantly gaining strength and conviction. To do less would be to fail in our duty to respect and to promote fundamental human rights.

40. It is therefore, as I have said on previous occasions, in South Africa's own long-term interest to swim with the tide. The front-line States have shown remarkable restraint. SWAPO has been constantly receptive to constructive suggestions, and even neighbouring countries, whose sovereignty has repeatedly been militarily violated by South Africa, have remained dedicated to a peaceful settlement, the latest demonstrations of good faith once more having been provided by Angola and, even more recently, while this very debate was in progress, by Botswana. We convey our deepest sympathy to these latest victims of South African aggression and condemn the incidents.

41. In the present cycle of violence, in the midst of gloom, even of despair, have we no source of hope? I still believe we do. What are our assets? First, the tremendous work already done and the tangible progress achieved; secondly, the determination of influential countries to continue their daunting, and, if I may say so, somewhat thankless task of persuasion and reassurances against the negative attitude of the South African authorities still ille-

gally occupying Namibia; thirdly, the dedicated efforts of the Secretary-General and his Special Representative; fourthly, the essential unity of the Council behind the settlement plan; fifthly, the common interest of all parties to bring about a peaceful and early regional settlement; and last, but certainly not least, the staunch determination of Namibians to secure their independence, led by SWAPO.

42. As never before, an additional powerful factor is coming into play. It was succinctly put by Anthony Lewis in his article in *The New York Times* last Thursday. He said: "The patience of most Americans for the official racism, inhumanity and violence of South Africa has run out." It had already run out in many other countries long ago. Influential citizens, corporations, religious institutions, trade unions and even state legislators are acting independently, bypassing the indifference of their own Governments to the deplorable present situation.

43. We in Malta have refrained from aiding, recognizing or even establishing contact with South Africa in any way in the past. This we will continue to do until Namibia becomes independent and until *apartheid* in South Africa is abolished. In the meantime, students from Namibia mix happily with others in our university and technical colleges. We will also respect any new decisions to be taken by the Security Council after the current debate. And we are ready to do even more.

44. On the occasion of the fortieth anniversary of the United Nations, we have asked ourselves some questions. What can we do to help the United Nations secure its objective in Namibia? Is there not something, no matter how small, within our modest means, that may be considered constructive and practical, and that we can offer so as to give a new momentum to the negotiating process that still lies ahead and that is all the more urgently needed now? We have found the answer, the objective and the inspiration in the very first article of our modern Constitution, which states that Malta is a democratic republic founded on work, on respect for the fundamental rights and freedom of the individual.

45. Malta is at the centre of Europe and Africa. We have benefited from the civilizations of both continents, as well as from Asia. We were a geological land bridge between the two continents in prehistoric times. We act as a political bridge to bring the two continents closer today. We constantly search for the ways of peace, and we are determined to work actively for its attainment.

46. To strive peacefully for an early solution to the question of Namibia falls therefore naturally in line with our foreign policy objectives. We derive some encouragement from the fact that, only a few years ago, in a largely similar situation of unilateral declaration of independence by Ian Smith of Rhodesia, it was in Malta that the breakthrough preceding Zimbabwe's independence was successfully negotiated, quietly, in contacts between the parties concerned. We have also acquired special expertise in comparative constitutional law, in electoral and voting systems and in human rights legislation, which could be useful at

least in bridging the gap between the parties on these aspects. We are therefore prepared to offer the same facilities, the same expertise, the same zeal and dedication to the Secretary-General, to the parties directly involved and to the members of the contact group, at any time considered useful, in whichever way may be considered most appropriate for quiet diplomacy, and for as long as necessary until a breakthrough is achieved. In doing so, we would be furthering our own policy of promoting reconciliation, of aiding the United Nations, and of upholding the prestige of the Security Council, thus responding in a modest but practical way to the appeal of the Secretary-General. We have no axes to grind; we have no vested interests to defend, other than a dedication towards success. We hope that the busy bustle of Valletta, and the "gentle temper" of the surrounding summer sea will help to secure progress.

47. Given South Africa's attitude, it is unfortunately only too likely that—publicly at least—it will continue to ignore the urgings even of its best friends. We can be sure, though, that it cannot forever ignore its own long-term self-interest. If, as it claims, it is really anxious to attain the best interests of the Namibian people, then surely there is no better way than to give them the freedom of choice by secret ballot under international supervision. Then the beloved country will cry no more.

48. Concurrently but separately—even if only in the narrow interest of their own economic imperatives—the South African authorities should attend to internal reform, to abolish *apartheid*, to free the whites from shame, the blacks from pain, and all its citizens from fear. Then, too, the people of South Africa will cry no more. Then—and only then—will South Africa regain the esteem of its friends, the respect and friendly co-operation of its neighbours and peace in its region. Then—and only then—will it have earned its rightful place among the family of nations. Perhaps—only perhaps—the minimalist social changes recently introduced in South Africa portray a delayed dawning of a new understanding of its national and international responsibilities. It is our fervent hope, in any case, that positive change is really on the way.

49. I thank you, Mr. President, and all the members of the Council, for graciously having permitted me to speak on this item today.

50. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of the Islamic Republic of Iran. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

51. Mr. RAJAIE KHORASSANI (Islamic Republic of Iran): Congratulations, Sir, on your assumption of the presidency. It so happened that, just when you undertook the task, one of the heaviest of all international complications also worked its way to the Council. However, I am glad that the problem, notwithstanding its impossible character, has fallen into capable hands.

52. Your predecessor, the representative of Thailand, too, conducted the affairs of the Council ably and effi-

ciently. My delegation wishes to thank him for all the sincerity and effort he devoted to the work of the Council.

53. Council resolution 435 (1978) seems to enjoy universal support—universal support because even the United States, though in a lip-service manner, claims to agree with it. That resolution is almost eight years old; yet it has not been implemented. The question is: if everybody, including the United States, is in full support of that resolution, why has it remained absolutely devoid of any operational significance? What is the obstacle and who has been obstructing its implementation throughout those eight painfully slow-moving years?

54. The Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples was adopted in 1960, that is, 25 years ago. Its twenty-fifth anniversary was celebrated in Tunisia last May. The United Nations is celebrating its fortieth anniversary. However, colonial domination over the people of Namibia is much older than even the United Nations itself. They have been under direct colonial yoke for a century; that is two and a half times longer than the entire history of the United Nations. None the less, they still have patiently to endure United States imperialism, simply because as declared by the United States representative on 12 June 1985, "the United States remains dedicated to this goal" and is "actively involved in negotiations to create conditions to allow implementation of the United Nations plan to proceed" [2587th meeting, para. 69].

55. Why after a century of suffering and of deprivation of the basic rights to freedom, do the oppressed people of Namibia have to wait for the "creative intelligence" of the United States to remain involved in those negotiations to create conditions to allow the implementation of the United Nations plan to proceed? The answer is to be found in the 350 American companies which are plundering the property of the region and which wish to preserve the *status quo* as long as possible in order to exploit those resources as long as possible. The answer is to be found in resources such as uranium, cobalt, manganese, platinum and many other strategic metals, which lie dormant in the land of Namibia.

56. The answer resides behind the fact that only last year American and other companies, from the gold mines of the region alone, benefited by more than \$850 million, and the *apartheid* régime too benefited by more than \$1.1 billion in the form of taxes alone. The United States does believe in the independence of Namibia, but it also maintains that all the Namibians

"should have the right to be heard, to express their views freely, to form political parties. They also have the right, as provided in resolution 435 (1978), to stand for election to represent their people. By the same token, however, none can be permitted to take power into their own hands, or to proclaim themselves the leaders of the Namibian people or the government of Namibia. Rather, it is for the people of Namibia to choose their own leaders in free and fair elections under United Nations supervision and control."

What I have read out is a quotation from the statement of the representative of the United States. It continues: "This remains our goal" [*ibid.*, para. 74]. By that, the United States Administration simply means that, if the people of Namibia are to have a government of their own, it must be some puppet régime which would still fulfil some of the demands of the United States multinational corporations and permit the substitution of colonialism by neo-colonialism. And since some other countries have a modest share in those multinational corporations, we can therefore appreciate why some other innocent-looking people who have been hiding their faces behind the United States have generously condoned a United States veto and have agreed with it on the necessity of patience for finding and creating some suitable conditions to allow implementation of the plan to proceed.

57. Why is it that when Americans are hijacked the United States savagely threatens retaliation against third countries, but that when the entire nation of Namibia has been held hostage by the United States for 100 years the provisions of Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations—the only guarantee for the implementation of resolution 435 (1978)—cannot be implemented? It is for that same reason that draft resolution S/17270 includes operative paragraph 14, which is a face-saving device for the Council.

58. The fact is that the claws of United States imperialism are squeezing the throat of the Middle East and the southern region of Africa to death, and the two Zionist régimes, one occupying Palestine and the other, the *apartheid* régime of Pretoria, are evil instruments of that inhumane, deadly purpose. Those who have installed those two régimes in those parts of the world are well equipped to support their agents here.

59. The people of Namibia are probably therefore convinced that the Council is not the organ from which authorization for the independence of Namibia can issue, in spite of the enormous goodwill that the present composition of the Council demonstrates. The present draft resolution is therefore as good as any—as good as resolution 435 (1978)—for neither one nor the other offer anything to the people of Namibia.

60. United States imperialism is a gigantic mountain, and the diplomatic pressures exerted on it here are like soft, beautiful spring rainfall. The diplomats of the United Nations who want to break United States imperialism by means of resolutions are like soft-hearted, innocent and primitive people hoping for the total erosion of that mountain by the annual spring rain. How many years will we have to wait? The answer is: for a complete geological period to pass. We have gone through three of them since the creation of the earth and the fourth is not yet completed. Some small soft hills and hilltops can be washed away naturally through annual rainfall, but huge mountains cannot be destroyed by United States resolutions. They may need dynamite.

61. We, the oppressed people of the third world, must therefore count on the armed struggle of the Namibian

people and the oppressed non-white majority of South Africa. The enemy must be fully convinced that it faces the iron fist of those deprived, oppressed peoples, who have nothing to lose anyway. And unless and until the militant peoples of southern Africa and Namibia, as well as the oppressed Moslems of Palestine in the Middle East, confront the enemy violently and forcefully, we here shall have to be patient and keep the United States involved and further involved in negotiations to create conditions to allow for the implementation of the United Nations plan to proceed.

62. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of Argentina. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

63. Mr. MUÑIZ (Argentina) (*interpretation from Spanish*): It is indeed a great pleasure to see you, Sir, the Minister for Foreign Affairs of Trinidad and Tobago, presiding over these important meetings of the Council. Gradually, Argentina and Trinidad and Tobago have been developing bonds of friendship and co-operation. Those bonds are based upon our belonging to the same region, where the fate of each country is linked to the fate of every other, and where we all support the same democratic and anti-colonialist principles. Those bonds will surely produce mutually beneficial results. My Government is convinced that regional solidarity is vital to the economic and social development of the Latin American countries and the countries of the Caribbean, something all of our peoples seek as a matter of priority.

64. I wish also to pay a tribute to the Minister for Foreign Affairs and the representative of Thailand, who guided the work of the Council so effectively during the month of May.

65. The disturbing impasse in the process towards the independence of Namibia fully justifies the convening of this series of meetings. Despite the years that have passed since the adoption of resolution 435 (1978), the sole acceptable basis for a peaceful, final solution of the question of Namibia, there has been little reason to believe that we are any closer to the end of this serious conflict—whose persistence poses a threat to international peace and security—than we were seven years ago. On the contrary, certain activities and positions of the South African Government appear to be aimed at perpetuating the colonial situation in Namibia or, at least, at permitting only a partial and conditional independence.

66. It is logical, then, that, together with other non-aligned countries, we should state our frustration and reiterate our request that the Council adopt new decisions.

67. In this connection, it is appropriate to recall that two years ago, when the Council reaffirmed the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia, it also agreed that if South Africa continued to oppose the full implementation of resolution 435 (1978), additional measures under the Charter of the United Nations would have to be adopted.

68. Although South Africa has claimed willingness to contribute to Namibia's final accession to independence and has seemed to recognize the need for this to take place in an internationally acceptable framework, the United Nations has ample reason to wonder about the sincerity of these declared intentions. Events such as the installation of an interim administration in Windhoek raise significant new obstacles to the achievement of that objective. Moreover, Namibia's territory continues to be used as a base for operations on the sovereign territory of Angola. The leaders and supporters of SWAPO, recognized by the General Assembly as the sole, authentic representative of the Namibian people, continue to be persecuted.

69. South Africa, above all, is insisting on conditions which have been repeatedly rejected by the United Nations. The linkage of the independence of Namibia with relations between South Africa and Angola is incompatible with the quest for regional harmony. The Namibian people has the inalienable right to full self-determination and independence, without pre-conditions or delays. It is time for Pretoria to adopt a truly constructive approach and make the express, formal commitment to implement the United Nations plan for the independence of Namibia.

70. Along with other non-aligned countries, Argentina vigorously condemns the illegal colonial occupation of Namibia and reiterates its firm support for the right of the Namibian people to self-determination and independence and to the establishment of a just, democratic and egalitarian society in the Territory.

71. As we have said before, the present situation in Namibia is an outright challenge to the credibility and effectiveness of the United Nations, that is, to the credibility and effectiveness of an international order based on justice and aimed at ensuring the maintenance of international peace and security and at making possible the development of harmonious relations and co-operation among States. The policy of South Africa, with its colonialist and racist overtones, is offensive to the rest of Africa and to the conscience of all mankind, and is simply incompatible with such an order. Therefore, the Council must react appropriately.

72. The special responsibility of the United Nations with respect to Namibia will be met, and the moral authority of the Council and of the Organization preserved, only if the Council takes measures which will help hasten the long overdue independence of Namibia, in keeping with resolution 435 (1978). If it continues, the present state of affairs will prove dangerous for the stability of southern Africa. We cannot discount the possibility of further, more serious confrontations.

73. Argentina therefore joins in the appeal of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries that the Council should take action beyond that which has been adopted in the past, under Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations.

74. Putting an end to the Namibian tragedy and eradicating totally and finally the odious system of *apartheid* must

be priorities for the international community. The persistence of these serious conflicts dangerously jeopardizes stability in international relations and generates tension to which Council, with its primary responsibility for the maintenance of international peace and security, must respond quickly and effectively.

75. The PRESIDENT: The next speaker is the representative of the United Arab Emirates. I invite him to take a place at the Council table and to make his statement.

76. Mr. AL-MOSFIR (United Arab Emirates) (*interpretation from Arabic*): Permit me at the outset to convey to you, Sir, the great pleasure of my delegation at seeing you presiding over the deliberations this month. We are confident that your diplomatic skill and political experience will enable you to lead the work of the Council to a successful conclusion.

77. I wish also to convey my sincere appreciation to the delegation of Thailand, led by its Minister for Foreign Affairs, for the excellent and efficient way in which they guided the work of the Council last month, during a time of many developments in different parts of the world.

78. I take this opportunity to express our deep gratitude to the Secretary-General for his tireless, dedicated efforts towards the early independence of Namibia. We reaffirm that we shall continue to give him support and co-operation in his work to promote the principles of the United Nations.

79. While this Council was seized of this question last week, the racist Government of South Africa launched an armed attack against the independent State of Botswana. That act of aggression took place after statements had been made in the Council by the representatives of some major Powers, in the light of which that racist Government realized that it would be safe to defy the international will and therefore carried out that act of aggression against the friendly Republic of Botswana.

80. The Council is called upon to react to this blatant defiance of its authority and responsibility towards the international community, that is to say, the maintenance of security and stability throughout the world. We in the United Arab Emirates condemn and deplore all forms of aggression. We call upon the Council to adopt resolutions commensurate with its grave responsibilities. Hence our immediate request is for the Council to invoke Chapter VII of the Charter of the United Nations at the end of its deliberations on the question entitled "The situation in Namibia".

81. At the end of this year, 1985, 100 years will have elapsed since the Berlin Conference, at which the colonialist division of the African continent took place and the colonial domination of Namibia started. The illegal occupation of that Territory by the racist South African régime has continued for 100 years.

82. Since 1978 the Council has held more than 130 meetings devoted to the consideration of crises afflicting the

peoples of southern Africa. The Security Council, the General Assembly and international organizations have adopted innumerable resolutions condemning and deploring the practices of the racist Government of South Africa against the Namibian people and the rightful owners of South Africa. These resolutions have also condemned the acts of aggression carried out by the racist minority régime of Pretoria against the front-line States.

83. These resolutions were supported by all countries that cherish freedom, justice and peace. Nevertheless, some major Powers shamelessly oppose them. What is strange is that those who support the Government of South Africa in international forums and oppose the imposition of global sanctions against that Fascist, racist Government, in accordance with the Charter, are those who claim to be the custodians of the freedom, democracy and independence of peoples.

84. What is freedom from their point of view? It is the freedom of the Fascist minority to manipulate the destiny of the majority and forcefully to plunder the resources of that majority without let or hindrance. What is democracy to them? It is the power of that puppet minority to force others into subjugation, even by murder, starvation and displacement.

85. True democracy is that which protects the human being in any part of the world against exploitation. It is that which upholds human rights and human dignity. It is that which deters the development corporations from plundering the riches of the nations.

86. What is the concept of the independence of peoples for those mighty Powers? It is simply the imposition of hegemony over countries, the plunder of their riches and the subjugation of their citizens to serve the invader.

87. To be true to history before the Council, we should like to remind the mighty of today, who believe that their might is invincible, and who believe that their racist allies in South Africa and occupied Palestine—the so-called Israel—will continue to enjoy their unlimited support, that their reading of the history of peoples is mistaken, that the history they read is false.

88. All struggling peoples have achieved victory, in spite of the weapons used to oppress them. The struggling people of Viet Nam achieved its victory, in spite of all the destructive weapons used against it. It did unify its territory and it did build its independent State.

89. As regards the great people of Algeria, France claimed that it had the power to force it into subjugation. It practised the first political air piracy operation in modern history against its national leaders, so as to dissuade that people from the achievement of its objectives of freedom and independence. But in the end France realized that might was not the right path, but that to be responsive to the will of the Algerian people was the path to the achievement of peace and freedom.

90. The United Kingdom believed that, by detaining or exiling Mahatma Gandhi and dispersing his supporters away from India, it would be able to keep the most precious jewel in the British crown under control. But the heroic people of India, under the leadership of Mahatma Gandhi, managed to restore the independence of the Indian sub-continent from the then strongest country in the world.

91. The same is true of the Hitler Nazi forces which fell before the strikes of the European peoples and their allies who aspired to rid themselves of oppression and humiliation.

92. All peoples have learned a basic lesson: the forces of liberation against invasion and occupation cannot be defeated by any Power, however big. These are the lessons of history we offer to those who have been intoxicated by force, who have supported wrong against right, who have supported the minority against the majority, who have protected the new fascism in Pretoria and Palestine, supplying it with money, arms and political support, so as to oppress the peoples of those regions. But peoples cannot be oppressed forever. They may be knocked down but never knocked out. They might fall down, but wounds soon heal and they come back like an irresistible wind that blows obstacles away.

93. The Council is meeting at the initiative of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries to affirm once again that non-aligned countries and peace and freedom-loving countries totally and categorically reject the prevarication, procrastination and linkage theory of the racist Government of South Africa and reject the continued obstruction by that régime of the implementation of Council resolution 435 (1978), embodying a clear plan for the independence of Namibia.

94. The United Arab Emirates wishes to reaffirm as follows its position on this question.

95. First, we call upon the members of the Council, in particular its permanent members, to work in an honest and responsible manner for the implementation of Security Council resolution 435 (1978) immediately and unconditionally, so as to enable the Namibian people to determine their own future and to build their independent State, including Walvis Bay, the Penguin Islands and all the offshore islands.

96. Secondly, we call for the immediate withdrawal of the racist Pretoria forces from all Namibian territory and the termination of its occupation of the country. We support the application of Chapter VII of the Charter against the Government of South Africa for its non-compliance with Security Council and General Assembly resolutions.

97. Thirdly, the Government of South Africa and its Western allies have chosen to inject a new condition into the Namibian independence issue, that is, the withdrawal of Cuban forces from Angola. That is interference in the internal affairs of an independent, sovereign State, and we

cannot but categorically reject interference in the internal affairs of any State from any quarter whatsoever. We totally reject the attempt and wish of the South African Government to establish a puppet "interim administration" that would carry out the wishes of that racist régime and give a false image of autonomy.

98. Fourthly, we affirm that attempts to reach a solution outside the United Nations are in contravention of the wish of the Namibian people and their legitimate representative, SWAPO.

99. Fifthly, my country unreservedly supports the national liberation movement, SWAPO, as the sole, legitimate representative of the Namibian people. We condemn aggression or the threat of aggression against the front-line States from any quarter whatsoever.

100. In conclusion, I reaffirm the request that this Council put an end to the behaviour and acts of the racists of Pretoria, and respond positively to the genuine wishes of the Namibian people. We express our great appreciation for the valiant role played by hero Sam Nujoma, the President of SWAPO, and congratulate SWAPO's leadership and fighters on the occasion of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the struggle for freedom and independence. We are confident that their struggle will be crowned with success.

101. The PRESIDENT: I shall now make a statement in my capacity as the representative of Trinidad and Tobago.

102. I address the Council in my capacity as Minister for Foreign Affairs of Trinidad and Tobago and do so having sat as President for several days and having heard representatives' statements on this burning question of the continued occupation of Namibia by South Africa—the question indeed of the continued defiance by South Africa of the will of the Council and of the United Nations as a whole.

103. This is Trinidad and Tobago's first term as a member of the Council. It is also the first time that we preside over its deliberations. This is therefore a signal honour for my country. We deem it particularly fitting that the first debate under our presidency should be on the question of Namibia, for Trinidad and Tobago, itself a former colony, has been unswerving in its support of the inalienable right of all peoples to self-determination and independence.

104. Trinidad and Tobago expresses its sincere appreciation to the Secretary-General for his deep personal commitment to the Namibian cause and his untiring and undaunted efforts to bring about the implementation of United Nations resolutions and decisions on Namibia.

105. We have noted the ardour, the commitment, the depth of feeling, even the unmistakable impatience and sense of frustration in the statements delivered in the Council on this issue. These are inevitable reactions to any consideration of the plight of the Namibian people and the continued brutal denial of justice which they experience.

Our frustration is compounded by recent events in southern Africa, including today's installation of an illegal puppet administration in Windhoek, the unwarranted incursion into Angolan territory earlier this month, and last week's brutal attack on Botswana which took place even while the Council was discussing a question of vital importance to peace and stability in that region.

106. Yet we have heard a statement by South Africa which makes bold to suggest that, if only the international community would co-operate with it, be patient and trusting, then all the questions relating to Namibia would be resolved. However, South Africa made no reference to its obligations under the Charter of the United Nations and to the Council and its several resolutions. The statement implied that the horrors of *apartheid* in South Africa, transferred to Namibia, are but simple aberrations for which that racist régime could in any event find justification.

107. *Apartheid*, which is indistinguishable from slavery as practised by earlier colonialists of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries, has been repeatedly rejected by the international community. The General Assembly has denounced it as a crime against humanity, while the Security Council has characterized it as being abhorrent to the conscience of mankind. Yet, South Africa persists in applying this heinous system to a Territory over which it has absolutely no right of administration.

108. We have noted the references to the many resolutions adopted year after year by the Council. They are resolutions which deal with the fundamental issues of freedom, liberty and justice—principles which form the cornerstone of the constitutions of Member States.

109. Must we, then, in this fortieth year of the founding of the United Nations and in the consideration of the question of Namibia by the international community, continue to be thwarted in our efforts to bring freedom and independence to the people of Namibia? In 1966, in its determination to bring about a just settlement of the Namibian question, the United Nations revoked South Africa's Mandate over the Territory and assumed direct responsibility for it. Notwithstanding that and the adoption of some 21 Council resolutions, the Pretoria régime continues to defy the authority of the United Nations and to maintain its illegal occupation of Namibia.

110. Trinidad and Tobago believes that it is time for the Council and the international community to take effective and definitive action to bring this unhappy episode to an end.

111. In past deliberations the Council provided a framework for terminating South Africa's illegal occupation and effecting the independence of Namibia. Resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978) contain the essential elements for meeting these objectives: the withdrawal of South Africa from Namibia; the transfer of power to the people of Namibia as one political entity, through free elections under the supervision and control of the United Nations; and the

establishment of a United Nations Transition Assistance Group (UNTAG) with a civilian and military component.

112. The Government of Trinidad and Tobago has consistently taken the position that the only acceptable plan of action for achieving Namibian independence remains that approved in resolution 435 (1978), amplifying as it does the principles embodied in resolution 385 (1976). However, it is a matter of deep regret that, years after the Council approved the detailed plan under which political power would be transferred to the people of Namibia with the assistance of the United Nations, the realization of the independence of Namibia continues to elude us.

113. It is universally recognized that one of the major achievements of the United Nations has been in the area of decolonization. Trinidad and Tobago has had the honour of serving for many years on the Special Committee on the Situation with regard to the Implementation of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples, including three years as its Chairman. Since the inception of the Special Committee we have seen many former colonies emerge from colonial status. For us, for most members of the Council and for the United Nations as a whole, the observance by the international community of the twenty-fifth anniversary of the Declaration on the Granting of Independence to Colonial Countries and Peoples is marred by the continued subjugation of the people of Namibia by the South African occupation régime. The people of Namibia continue to be oppressed, brutalized and exploited; their resources continue to be plundered and despoiled.

114. It must now be manifest that South Africa does not intend to relinquish its hold on Namibia, nor to respect the authority of the United Nations. Two months ago the Pretoria régime announced its decision to establish a so-called interim government in illegally occupied Namibia. The Security Council responded with a presidential statement on 3 May [S/17151], declaring the establishment of the so-called interim government to be null and void. That statement and international condemnation notwithstanding, South Africa has proceeded to install the so-called interim government. That manoeuvre by South Africa constitutes clear defiance of the decisions of the Council, particularly resolutions 385 (1976) and 435 (1978). It is further evidence of South Africa's total disregard of the demands of the Namibian people for self-determination and independence. That action by South Africa is an attempt to perpetuate the system of *apartheid*, with all its odious characteristics, in a territory for which the United Nations is directly responsible.

115. The full implementation of the provisions of resolution 435 (1978) is dependent upon the co-operation of South Africa, but can we depend upon South Africa, which has imposed a most brutal and dehumanizing régime, inimical to the interests of black people, to co-operate in the introduction of a liberal, democratic system in Namibia, whose population is predominantly black? Should the United Nations, and the Council in particular, stand by without taking any direct action?

116. It is clear that the policy of constructive engagement, propounded as a substitute for direct action, has failed, and that policies of dialogue, political support and economic co-operation have not produced their desired effect. Even the unilateral action of certain Member States to isolate South Africa, based on their perception and assessment of the most effective way of combating the régime's defiance of international law and of responding to the overwhelmingly censorious burden of international opinion, as reflected in decisions of, *inter alia*, the Security Council, the General Assembly, the International Court of Justice, the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries and the Organization of African Unity, has failed to have any real impact on South Africa's recalcitrance.

117. The determination of South Africa to maintain its oppressive and illegal occupation of Namibia constitutes a grave threat to international peace and security. For as long as the illegality of that occupation continues, southern Africa will not have peace, the dignity of Africa will continue to be outraged, the will of the international community to be affronted and disrespected and the integrity and credibility of the Council to be subverted. The failure of the United Nations to deal decisively with South Africa over the question of Namibia forces the conclusion, which has been adumbrated in the course of our debate, that options for non-violent solutions may soon run out. The United Nations must of necessity, therefore, institute more effective measures to put an end to the intransigence of South Africa and avoid confrontation, violence and bloodshed.

118. Trinidad and Tobago is of the view that it is imperative that the Security Council move with dispatch on this matter and mandate the Secretary-General to initiate contact with South Africa with a view to finalizing the choice of the electoral system to be used for elections for the Constituent Assembly, under United Nations supervision and control. The Secretary-General should also be mandated to take appropriate steps for the introduction of UNTAG into Namibia, as provided for in resolution 435 (1978).

119. Trinidad and Tobago is pleased to associate itself with the Programme of Action [see S/17184 and Corr.1,

annex] adopted by the Extraordinary Ministerial Meeting of the Co-ordinating Bureau of Non-Aligned Countries on the question of Namibia, held at New Delhi last April, and to be one of the six Council members, all States members of the Movement of Non-Aligned Countries, which are sponsors of the draft resolution before us [S/17284]. It provides a clear-cut, step-by-step approach for early implementation of the internationally agreed plan for Namibian independence. We urge all members of the Council to support the draft and in so doing send a clear message to the Pretoria régime that its machinations and prevarications will be tolerated no longer.

120. History has shown that the realization of the rights and aspirations of a people to freedom and independence may be delayed, but can never be denied. The history of Namibia is the history of a trust unceasingly betrayed. It is the history of a people struggling against foreign occupation, oppression and exploitation to realize their inalienable right to self-determination and independence; of a people waiting, so far in vain, for the realization of their hopes and aspirations and the implementation of the will of the international community. Let us act now, together, to bring an end to this sad phase in world history and usher in a new dawn of freedom for the people of Namibia, and in so doing assert the primary responsibility of the Security Council for the maintenance of international peace and security.

121. I now resume my function as PRESIDENT.

122. I call on the representative of the United States, who has asked to speak in exercise of the right of reply.

123. Mr. CLARK (United States of America): I should just like to say that, particularly at this time, we find the remarks about hostages made today in the Council by the representative of Iran to be false, disturbing and tasteless.

The meeting rose at 5.50 p.m.